

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Final Office Action mailed September 22, 2009. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-33, 36-40, 42-43, 45-46 and 48-88 were pending in the Application and stand rejected. Claims 13-30 were withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY FOR DECEMBER 23, 2009

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting the telephone interview on December 23, 2009, and for the thoughtful consideration of this case. During the telephone interview, Applicant and Examiner discussed a modest set of possible amendments. Any subsequent amendments to the claims were not based on reasons related to patentability and Applicant reserves the right for future commentary concerning the rationale behind these amendments.

Section 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 31-33, 43, 46, 51, 53, 55-64 and 77-88 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0141418 issued to Ben-Dor et al. (hereinafter "*Ben-Dor*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,885 issued to Bondi (hereinafter "*Bondi*"). The Examiner further rejects Claims 6-10, 12, 36-40, 42, 45, 48-50, 52 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ben-Dor* in view of *Bondi* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,950 issued to Krishnan (hereinafter "*Krishnan*"). Claims 11 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ben-Dor* in view of *Bondi* further in view of *Krishnan* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,881 issued to Gottfurcht et al. (hereinafter "*Gottfurcht*"). Claims 65-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ben-Dor* in view of *Bondi* further in view of Official Notice (hereinafter "*Official Notice*").

Independent Claim 1 recites "...a polling routine configured to poll each of possible USB device adapters connected to the network in accordance with a candidate list...the polling routine is further configured to encapsulate a USB packet in one or more network packets." For this last underlined limitation, there is nothing in *Ben-Dor* for this feature.

In addition, the other Independent Claims recite limitations that are similar, but not identical, and are therefore allowable over the proposed combination(s) using a similar rationale. In addition, the respective dependent claims from these Independent Claims should be allowable using analogous reasoning.

For at least these reasons, all of the pending claims have been shown to be allowable as they are patentable over the references of record. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

No additional fees are believed due. However, please apply any other charges or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4889 of PATENT CAPITAL GROUP, referencing the attorney docket number referenced above.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214-823-1241.

Respectfully submitted,

Patent Capital Group
Attorneys for Applicant

/Thomas J. Frame/

Thomas J. Frame

Reg. No. 47,232

Date: December 23, 2009

Customer No. 86421